



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST-NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,254	02/26/2002	Scott R. Gremmert	H0002864	1711

128 7590 10/28/2005

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC.  
101 COLUMBIA ROAD  
P O BOX 2245  
MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

DO, CHAT C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2193

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/085,254	GREMMERT, SCOTT R.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Chat C. Do	2193	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 September 2005 and 08 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 and 49-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 9 and 33 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-32, 34-36, 49-53, and 56-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 54 and 55 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 07/08/2005.
2. Claims 1-36 and 49-59 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 11, 14, 21, 28, and 33 are independent claims. In Amendment, claims 37-48 are cancelled and claims 54-59 are added. This Office Action is made non-final after a RCE filed 09/08/2005.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3, 6, 10-25, 28, 34-36, 49-53, and 56-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bae et al. (U.S. 5,968,111).

Re claim 1, Bae et al. disclose in Figures 2B and 3 a method for filtering data (e.g. abstract with median technique) the method comprising: receiving a plurality of data samples (e.g. R[0]-R[8] in Figure 2B); computing a locus of the samples (e.g. col. 3 lines 2-10); normalizing (e.g. col. 3 lines 21-33) a value of an input sample to a range centered on the locus; passing the data through a distance-based filter (e.g. 31); normalizing (e.g. col. 4 lines 12-17) an output value of the distance-based filter to a predetermined output range; and limiting the normalized output value of the distance-based filter within

selected limits of normalization (e.g. Figures 2B & 3 and col. 2 lines 40-59 wherein the value of final output of the circular filter must be within the unit circle in angles  $\{0, \pm \pi/2\}$  or in magnitudes  $\{\pm 1\}$ ).

Re claim 2, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 the distance-based filter further comprises a median (abstract lines 1-2).

Re claim 3, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 the distance-based filter further comprises a low-pass (Figure 2B relates to a filter within a unit circle in phase and a magnitude; col. 4 lines 25-29).

Re claim 6, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 computing a locus of the samples comprises computing one of an arithmetic mean (e.g. equation 1 in col. 3), a geometric mean, a harmonic mean, and a quadratic mean of the samples.

Re claim 10, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 computing a locus of the samples comprises selecting a previous filter output value (e.g. Table 4).

Re claim 11, Bae et al. disclose in Figures 2B and 3 a method for filtering data (abstract), the method comprising: determining (col. 3 lines 2-9) a current locus of a plurality of data samples as a function of signal history; determining (col. 3 lines 22-32) a current normalizing range as a function of the current locus; normalizing (col. 3 lines 22-32) an input value to the current normalizing range; passing (31 in Figure 3) the input value and the current locus through a distance-based filter; normalize (col. 4 lines 12-17) an output value of the distance-based filter to the current normalizing range; and adjusting the output value of the distance-based filter and internal filter storage within a selected output range (e.g. Figures 2B & 3 and col. 2 lines 40-59 wherein the value of

final output of the circular filter must be within the unit circle in angles  $\{0, \pm\pi/2\}$  or in magnitudes  $\{\pm 1\}$ , and in addition the storage is circular buffer).

Re claim 12, it has same limitations cited in claims 2, 3, or 4. Thus, claim 12 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claims 2, 3, or 4.

Re claim 13, it has same limitations cited in claim 6. Thus, claim 13 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 6.

Re claim 14, it is a device claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 14 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 15, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 a means for comparing the distance between the input value and the locus with a predetermined threshold value (e.g. equation 2 with Max and Min).

Re claim 16, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 a means for normalizing the distance between the input value and the locus when the distance exceeds a predetermined limit (e.g. equation 2 with Max and Min).

Re claim 17, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 normalizing the distance between the input value and the locus includes adjusting the sample to be within one-half circle of the locus (e.g. equation 2 with Max and Min and lines 28 in col. 3).

Re claim 18, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 a means for comparing the output value with a predetermined threshold value (e.g. equation 2 with Max and Min).

Re claim 19, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 a means for normalizing the output value when the output value exceeds a predetermined limit (e.g. applying equation 2 with Max and Min).

Re claim 20, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 normalizing the output value includes adjusting the output value to be within a predetermined output range (e.g. equation 2 within a unit circle).

Re claim 21, it is a system claim of claim 11. Thus, claim 21 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 11.

Re claim 22, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 the function of determining an output value includes applying a distance-based filter to the plurality of data samples (Figure 3).

Re claim 23, it has same limitations cited in claim 16. Thus, claim 23 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 16.

Re claim 24, it has same limitations cited in claim 19. Thus, claim 24 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 19.

Re claim 25, Bae et al. further disclose in Figures 2B and 3 the function of processing at least a portion of the plurality of data samples to compute a locus of the samples includes computing an approximation of the locus of the samples (equation 2 and col. 3 lines 27-32).

Re claim 28, it is a computer program product claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 28 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 34, it is a computer program product claim of claim 10. Thus, claim 34 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 10.

Re claim 35, it is a computer program product claim of claim 2. Thus, claim 35 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 2.

Re claim 36, it is a computer program product claim of claim 6. Thus, claim 36 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 6.

Re claim 49, Bae et al. further disclose the step of receiving a plurality of data samples further comprises receiving a plurality of normalized data samples (e.g. the new input data is same as the replacing/oldest data).

Re claim 50, it has same limitations cited in claim 49. Thus, claim 50 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 49.

Re claim 51, it is a device claim of claim 49. Thus, claim 51 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 49.

Re claim 52, it is a system claim of claim 49. Thus, claim 52 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 49.

Re claim 53, it is a computer program product claim of claim 49. Thus, claim 53 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 49.

Re claim 56, Bae et al. further disclose adjusting the output value of the distance-based filter and internal filter storage within a selected output range further comprises adjusting the output value and internal filter storage locations by plus or minus one circle (e.g. Figures 2B & 3 and col. 2 lines 40-59 wherein the value of final output of the

circular filter must be within the unit circle in angles  $\{0, \pm\pi/2\}$  or in magnitudes  $\{\pm 1\}$ , and in addition the storage is circular buffer).

Re claim 57, it has same limitations as cited in claim 56. Thus, claim 57 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 56.

Re claim 58, it is a system claim of claim 56. Thus, claim 58 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 56.

Re claim 59, it has same limitations as cited in claim 56. Thus, claim 59 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 56.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 4-5, 7-8, 26-27, 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Bae et al. (U.S. 5,968,111) in view of Connell et al. (U.S. 6,018,750).

Re claim 4, Bae et al. do not disclose in Figures 2B and 3 the distance-based filter further comprises one of a band-pass filter and a high-pass filter. However, Connell et al. disclose the distance-based filter further comprises one of a band-pass filter and a high-pass filter (col. 1 lines 50-54). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add one of a band-pass filter and a high-pass filter as seen in Connell et al.'s invention into Bae et al.'s invention



because it would enable to reduce the roughness of input signal or allow larger input tolerate signal.

Re claims 5 and 7-8, Bae et al. do not disclose in Figures 2B and 3 computing a locus of the samples comprises computing an average of a last two or three of the samples with the input sample. However, Connell et al. disclose in Figure 2 that the next median data is computed based on the incoming sample and the outgoing data sample (Figure 2 part 205) and also the median is computed by averaging the samples (Table 1 in col. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to add a computation of a locus of the samples comprises computing an average of a last two or three of the samples with the input sample as seen in Connell et al.'s invention into Bae et al.'s invention because it would enable to reduce the roughness of input signal or allow larger input tolerate signal without producing meaningless result by statistically computing over many samples.

Re claim 26, it has same limitation cited in claim 5. Thus, claim 26 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 27, it has same limitation cited in claim 5. Thus, claim 27 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 29, it is a computer program product claim of claim 5. Thus, claim 29 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 30, it is a computer program product claim of claim 5. Thus, claim 30 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 5.

Re claim 31, it is a computer program product claim of claim 7. Thus, claim 31 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 7.

Re claim 32, it is a computer program product claim of claim 8. Thus, claim 32 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 8.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

7. Claims 9 and 33 are allowed.
8. Claims 54 and 55 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed 07/08/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
  - a. The applicant argues in page 10 for claim 1 that the cited reference by Bae et al. fails to limit the normalized output value of the distance-based filter within selected limits of normalization as cited in the claimed invention.

The examiner respectfully submits that the output sample of the Bae et al.'s circular median filter is within of predetermined maximum and minimum values (e.g. col. 3 lines 20-30). These maximum and minimum values are considered as the bounds of normalization.

b. The applicant argues in page 10 for claim 55 or other claims with similar features that the cited reference by Bae et al. fails to disclose a means for adjusting the filter output value and the internal filter storage locations by plus or minus one circle as cited in the claimed invention.

The examiner respectfully submits that the cited storage is in circular buffer and the value of final output of the circular filter must be within the unit circle in angles  $\{0, \pm\pi/2\}$  or in magnitudes  $\{\pm 1\}$  as seen in Figure 3, particularly the magnitude of unit circuit is in the range of  $\pm 1$ .

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., limitations cited in the last paragraph in page 10 as "Bae et al. fail to teach....such an eventuality") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chat C. Do whose telephone number is (571) 272-3721. The examiner can normally be reached on M => F from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chaki Kakali can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chat C. Do  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2193

October 26, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Chat C. Do', written in a cursive style.